REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-16, 18-20 and 22-28 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ishida in view of McCormack and further in view of Wilson. Claims 21 and 1 were also subject to objection and rejection, respectively, because of informalities. Claims 1 and 12 are currently amended. Claim 21 is now removed from the listed claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The presently claimed invention distinguishes the cited combination because the power module includes a voltage level converter for adapting the Power-Over-Ethernet voltage **to energize the data storage device**. The Office relies solely on McCormack for teaching a voltage level converter for powering an end device, i.e., the transformer (40) at Col. 7, lines 27-37. However, a careful review of the cited passage reveals that the transformer (40) is not used for voltage conversion to power the device but rather for the purpose of isolating the transmitter and circuitry (16) from the Ethernet wiring. In particular, McCormack teaches that "the hub includes a transformer 40, associated with each port, **which isolates the transmitter and related circuitry** 16 from Ethernet twisted pair wiring 14." (emphasis added) (Col. 7, lines 26-28) There is no mention in that passage, nor anywhere else in McCormack, of voltage conversion by that transformer for providing a voltage that actually powers the end device. Rather, McCormack teaches how to detect the presence of the end device via a voltage drop caused by the end device. (See Col. 7, lines 38-54) Further, as taught at Col. 7, lines 41-44, the McCormack **supply-side controller (54) sets the voltage level, rather than the receiver-side adjusting the voltage level**. Therefore, McCormack actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention. For the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 12 distinguish the cited combination by reciting "wherein the power module includes a power converter for converting the power received from the power

integrated network from a first voltage level to a second voltage level to energize the data storage device to energize the data storage device." Similarly, claim 8 recites "converting the power received from the power integrated network from a first voltage level to a second voltage level; and using the converted power to energize the data storage device." Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 8 and 12 is therefore requested.

Claims 2-3, 7, 11, 13-16, 18-20 and 22-28 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims is therefore also requested.

The informalities have been corrected as required by the Office. In particular, claim 21 has been removed from the listed claims and antecedent basis has been provided in claim 1 for "the plurality of clients" in line 6. Withdrawal of the §112 rejection and objection is therefore requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

March 23, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson /
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-167
Dd: 4/3/2006